



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace

VOL. LXXX

AUGUST, 1918

NUMBER 8

A HOPEFUL STATEMENT

WE GIVE to our readers the statement by Nicholas Murray Butler, prepared for the London *Daily Chronicle* of July 27th and appearing likewise in the New York *Times* of July 28. This is evidently a measured and carefully prepared expression following judgments matured by years of attention to international affairs and tempered by a world war in which the United States is actively engaged. Dr. Butler is not only President of Columbia University, he is a recognized educational leader in the broadest sense; a politician of the publicist type, author of such well-known books as, "The Meaning of Education," "The International Mind,"—a man to whom men listen not only in this country but abroad.

One might be surprised at Dr. Butler's approval of Mr. Asquith's provision for "force" as the "rule of authority of an international court," especially since he himself says that "such a league of nations as is here outlined will rest upon a moral foundation. Its aim will be to advance the good order, the satisfaction, and the happiness of the world. It will not be and should not be merely a league to enforce peace. A league of that name might well rest solely upon force and entirely overlook both law and equity." But it will be noted that neither Dr. Butler nor Mr. Asquith contemplates the use of force save "in the last resort," a contingency the possibilities of which must of course be recognized.

Since nations act rarely save upon precedent, unless driven by imperative circumstance, such as war, President Butler renders us a service by suggesting the advisability of making the present league a "permanent addition to the world's organization for order and peaceable progress." We assume that he regards the league of the Entente Powers simply as a nucleus to the larger union which we prefer to call the Society of Nations. In any event such a league, when after the war it includes all the great Powers of the world, would, if it attempt not "too much," spell the overthrow of the old threatening alliances, undermine the necessity for overgrown armaments, make possible of realization the advantages of the "most favored nation clause," and all to the lessening of the causes of war and to the furtherance of the principles of justice between the Powers within the Society of Nations.

We are greatly interested and encouraged to note the expression of belief that "the International Court of

Justice urged by the American delegation at the Second Hague Conference should now be called into being." President Butler is acquainted with the work done by the American delegates at the Second Hague Conference. He knows that it was a great work and that it met the unanimous approval of the Nations. His reference therefore to the organization and the jurisdiction of the proposed international tribunal is based on accurate information. His suggestion that in the interest of open diplomacy and world peace all treaties to be valid should be filed in copy with that Court at the Hague is a happy one. At last we shall all agree that it is now perfectly clear that governments must plan to give up certain "rights" now known to be antagonistic to the rights of other nations and therefore not rights at all. Yet no unthinkable sacrifices are here proposed. So far as the establishment of the Court is concerned, nothing new is suggested save that the step be taken now.

But our purpose here is not to rehearse this adequate and timely contribution, but to thank the author.

LET US FACE THE FACTS

THERE is little difference of opinion about the aims which the allies have in view as they prosecute this war. It is the end of war; it is the old aspiration of the Pax Romana, with its permanent arbitral body and its reign of law; of the Holy Roman Empire supporting the Emperor in his attempt to prohibit private wars; of the Peace of Paris that tried to supplant the "good nationalist" with the "good European"; of the Holy Alliance with its dream of a world peace; indeed, of Buddha, of Isaiah, of Christ.

While the end is clear, the means are, as in all these cases, difficult clearly to prevision, and, therefore, to establish. The Chinese have the sage observation, "What one knows not how to do is difficult; what one knows how to do is not." The difficulties of any league of peace is not "peace," which is the end, but the "league" which is the means. How to set up such a league is clear only to him who thinks first in poetry or thinks not at all.

Shall we of the United States agree to an international league which shall bind our government to go to war under conditions now incapable of forecast? Is it reasonable to expect that the United States Senate would agree to an international organization planned for the contingency of an American attack upon Great Britain, or of a British war against America? Should